

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 6.]

JUNE, 1860.

[PRICE 1½d.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THOMAS EMLYN.

THOMAS EMLYN was born at Stamford, in Lincolnshire, in the year 1663. His parents, though they stately attended the worship of the Established Church, were friendly to the principles of the Nonconformists; and accordingly, even at that period, when such a destination held out no flattering prospect, and might lead to bonds and imprisonment, they did not hesitate to devote their son to the Christian ministry in that connexion. For this purpose, after the usual preparatory course of grammar learning, he was sent, in 1678, to an academical institution conducted by a Mr. Shuttleworth, at Sulby, in Northamptonshire. For a short time he was admitted at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was afterwards transferred to the academy of Mr. Dolittle, in the neighbourhood of London. He seems to have speedily acquired reputation as a young man of acquirement and promise; for, in 1683, when only twenty years of age, he became chaplain to the Countess of Donegal, who then resided in London, and the following year went over with her family to Belfast, in Ireland, where she was shortly afterwards married to Sir W. Franklin. Here he continued for some years in his capacity of chaplain, with a liberal salary, and was treated with great respect and distinction. Sir W. Franklin, who had a large property in the west of England, offered to present him to a considerable living in that part of the country; but he declined it, not in consequence of any scruples on the doctrine of the Trinity, respecting which no difficulties had as yet arisen in his mind, but from a dissatisfaction with the prescribed terms of

ministerial conformity. The disturbances which took place in the north of Ireland in consequence of the landing of James II. in that country, occasioned the breaking up of the Countess of Donegal's establishment, and Emlyn retired to England. Having no immediate engagement in England, he accepted an invitation from Sir Robert Rich, one of the Lords of the Admiralty, to his seat near Beccles, in Suffolk, and was induced by him to officiate as minister to a small dissenting congregation at Lowestoff, in that county. Here he remained about a year and a-half, though without formally undertaking the pastoral charge.

At this period, however, he formed an intimate acquaintance with Mr. W. Manning, a worthy dissenting minister at Peasenhall, in his neighbourhood. Their congenial habits and pursuits occasioned frequent meetings, and they engaged together in theological inquiries, mutually communicating to each other their respective sentiments and conclusions; in which, as it happened, they were both led to deviate widely from the opinions then generally prevalent. The doctrine of the Trinity, in particular, they agreed; first in doubting, and at length in rejecting altogether.

When James II. was driven back to France, and affairs in Ireland assumed a more peaceable and settled appearance, Mr. Emlyn was induced to accept an overture to become joint pastor with Mr. Joseph Boyse, of the Presbyterian congregation in Wood Street, Dublin. To this city he accordingly removed in 1691; and here he continued in a station of great comfort and prosperity for nearly twelve years. A few years after he settled at Dublin he married Mrs. Esther Bury, a widow lady, with a hand-

some jointure; and thus being possessed of an easy competence, successful and acceptable in the discharge of his ministerial duties, apparently respected and beloved by his congregation and friends, and peculiarly blest in his domestic relations, he seemed to enjoy the fairest prospect of permanent and increasing usefulness, and of a reasonable share of temporal respectability and comfort. But it had pleased a wise Providence to order it otherwise, and dark clouds were presently destined to overshadow the scene which for some time appeared so bright and promising.

Mr. Emlyn had not as yet divulged his abandonment of the prevailing views of the Trinity, which were zealously maintained by his colleague, and doubtless by at least a large majority of his congregation.

"I own" (he tells us in his very interesting narrative of the proceedings against him) "I had been unsettled in my notions from the time I read Dr. Sherlock's book of the Trinity.—Till I had upon much serious thought and study of the Holy Scriptures, with many concerned addresses to the Father of lights, found great reason first to doubt, and after, by degrees, to alter my judgment in relation to the formerly received opinions of the Trinity and the *Supreme Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ. For though the word of God was my rule, I could not tell how to understand that rule but by the use of my reason; knowing well, that he who tells me I must lay aside my reason, when I believe the gospel, does plainly declare that to believe it is to act without reason, and that no rational man could be a Christian. I desired only to know *what* I must believe, and *why*. As to the latter, I was satisfied that divine revelation is a sufficient ground of belief; but then I must conceive what it is that it reveals, and that I am explicitly to believe and profess. Accordingly I was ever careful not to speak against my own judgment, or what should appear so to a judicious hearer, that I might not act against Christian sincerity; and yet I never confronted the opinions of others by express or unhandsome opposition;—I doubted whether this was my duty, or proper in the pulpit where I could have

freedom to say all that was requisite in such a controversy, and whether I ought at once to cast myself out of a station of service without a more particular and direct occasion given me to profess my mind, which I did apprehend might offer, and which I was determined to accept when it did."

While this subject was dwelling on his mind, his domestic happiness was painfully interrupted—first, by the death of an infant son, and afterwards (towards the end of 1701) by that of his wife. On this latter occasion he preached a sermon from John xiv. 28. This sermon was afterwards printed (during the darkest season of his own approaching personal troubles), under the title of "Funeral Consolations," and contains many passages, which for eloquence, pathos, and true Christian feeling, are not surpassed by anything in our language. He makes no distinct allusion or express mention of the lamented subject of his discourse, but towards the close, delicately but indirectly portrays her character.

In the Preface there is an affecting reference to the hard and injurious treatment under which he was at that time labouring. After adverting to the delay which had taken place in the publication of this sermon, "I must own," he proceeds, "that I had probably done it sooner, had I not been diverted by many troubles; the issue of which has been such as has not only given me more leisure to review this sermon, but also more occasion often to retire to a serious contemplation of the matter therein contained. What my sufferings (for a principle of conscience) have been, or for what cause I suffered as *an evil-doer unto bonds*, I intend not here to complain. It suffices me to leave my complaint with God, whom I desire to serve according to my best understanding; and if I may but please Him, the Judge and Giver of the prize, I shall be less anxious for the applause of spectators, who must themselves be judged also."

It was about nine months after Mrs. Emlyn's decease that a leading member of the congregation, being struck not so much with anything positive in Mr. Emlyn's preaching or other public services, as with the absence of all reference

to certain orthodox doctrines on occasions when a man who had no doubt or difficulties on these points would scarcely have omitted them, communicated his suspicions to Mr. Boyse, the other minister. They jointly waited on Mr. Emlyn, and requested to know what his real sentiments on the subject were. When thus called upon, he did not hesitate to acknowledge, or rather openly to declare, what his faith was; and avowed himself convinced that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is alone the Supreme Being, superior in excellence and authority to his Son, who derives all from him. He told them at the same time, that he had no aim to make strife among them, and offered to leave the congregation, that they might choose another in his place. This, however, was not the course they chose to adopt. Mr. Boyse brought the affair before a meeting of the Presbyterian ministers in Dublin, who seem to have been allowed to exercise a sort of control and inquisitorial interference in the concerns of other congregations, which those of us who in this country still call ourselves by that name are at a loss to comprehend. A conference took place between Mr. Emlyn and this conclave, at which he candidly explained his sentiments, and they, without further deliberation or delay, cast him off, and decreed that he should not preach any more; and this without any communication with his own flock, the only parties who had any real concern in the affair, of which as yet they were utterly ignorant. Mr. Emlyn immediately called the deacons and other managers of the church together, acquainted them with the circumstances, and requested their dismissal. To this they were unwilling to accede, but proposed to him to go away presently into England for awhile, to afford time for further consideration. The ministers gave their sanction to the arrangement, but withal charged him not to preach during his absence. To this imperious mandate he returned a spirited reply, asserting his undoubted right and full determination to use his discretion in this matter, without asking for their permission. He accordingly departed for England, though with great personal inconvenience, the very next day.

"And now," says he, "I had leisure to look back; for when so few days' space had made so great a change in my condition, that I was turned out to wander abroad desolate and in uncertainty, I saw I was entered upon a dark scene, and must arm for various, though I knew not what, trials—I had not been of so unsocial a nature as not to relish the society and love of my dear friends, nor yet so mortified to the world as not to feel some difference between contempt and respect, fulness and straits; but still my convictions of truth were so clear, that these things never staggered my resolutions of adhering to it in the midst of all discouragements. Yet Mr. Boyse, in the preface to his Answer to my Humble Inquiry, taxes me with insincerity in continuing so long in communion with those of a different persuasion. But as I think it was matter deserving of great deliberation, so I did not see anything sinful required of me; we worshipped one God through Jesus Christ the Mediator, and I had my part in leading the devotions of the society. We had no worship of *three modes* expressed; and other men's different confused notions did not affect my worship when not imposed on me, who still say that, if they worshipped but one infinite Supreme Mind, they worshipped the same object of supreme worship with me; and as for the secret worship of *three modes*, of which there is not one word in Scripture, I understand no more than themselves what they mean by those terms, or rather they mean nothing at all by them that I can find; and I am persuaded that not three of the whole church could agree in the same rational account, if put to it, of these matters."

On his return to Ireland, Mr. Emlyn found that a great clamour had been raised against him in his absence, both in the pulpit and elsewhere; he therefore thought that justice to himself as well as to the truth required that he should show what evidence from Scripture he had on his side, and accordingly he wrote and published his "Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ."

As soon as might be after the appearance of this tract, it was Mr. Emlyn's intention to have returned to England.

Some, however, of the most bigoted and hot-headed dissenters (with singular inconsistency, considering that they themselves had at this very time in Ireland no legal toleration, but were only connived at) were resolved to have him prosecuted, and with this view procured a warrant from the Chief Justice, Sir Richard Payne, to seize the author and his books.

The Chief Justice was at first disposed to refuse bail, but afterwards consented, and two sufficient persons were bound in £800 for his appearance. The indictment, after having been three several times altered before it could be finally settled, occasioned the trial to be postponed till June 14th, 1703. On that day, before the court sat, Mr. Emlyn was apprised by an eminent counsel that he would not be permitted to speak freely, but that it was determined to run him down like a wolf, without law, or game; and he soon found that this was not said without sufficient reason. Six or seven bishops were present, including the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, who took their seats upon the bench. "If," says Mr. Emlyn, "they had used arguments with me, or had informed the court how unfit a jury of tradesmen were to judge of abstruse points of divinity, or had protested, as holy bishops of old did, against that strange and unheard of impiety, that a spiritual or church affair should come before a secular judicature, I should have thought it would have been to their praise."

There was no little difficulty in procuring legal evidence that Mr. Emlyn was the author of the book; and it was not so much proved at last, as taken for granted on the presumptive ground of a conformity between the opinions maintained in it, and those which he had professed in conference with Mr. Boyse and his brother ministers. And the main question still remained, whether what was quoted from the book was blasphemy. But this was never spoken to at all. "I intended," says Mr. Emlyn, "after the matter-of-fact was over, to have spoken on this head, and to have shown how unreasonable it was to account that blasphemy which, for the manner of it, had not been uttered with

any token of a designing contempt; and, for the matter of it, was not very different from what divers learned men and dignitaries of the church had published. I could have shown that men of great probity and character differ very much about these matters; and that, if a mere error must be judged blasphemy by a party of the contrary opinion, then may anything be judged such, let but the adverse party have but the drawing of the consequences. But my counsel would say nothing on this head on my behalf, and they would not let me speak for myself; when I offered it, the Queen's counsel turned upon me, and cried, Speak by your counsel."

The Chief Justice seems to have acted the part of an accuser rather than a judge; and the jury, intimidated by his representation, and probably overawed by the unwonted presence of so many dignitaries of the church, brought in, with apparent reluctance, a verdict of guilty. When the verdict was pronounced, the Attorney-General moved that the prisoner might have the honour of the pillory; but sentence was deferred till the last day of the term, and in the mean time he was committed to the common gaol. Mr. Boyse exerted himself to prevent the rigorous sentence the Attorney-General had moved for. Mr. Emlyn himself also addressed the following letter to the Chief Justice on his own behalf:—

"My Lord,—Though your Lordship may perhaps judge me guilty of a fault that you cannot admit any apology for, yet I may presume upon so much compassion as to have leave to offer something by way of mitigation. I do assure your Lordship, that I have no greater desire than to learn the truth from the Holy Scriptures, by which I shall always be guided according to my best light; and if I am mistaken in my opinions, God knows, it is altogether unwillingly. It is most obvious that I have forfeited my interest, and sacrificed my reputation in the world, and exposed myself to such evils, as nothing could ever make me submit to, but the real fear of offending God; which your Lordship will, I doubt not, allow for a very great reason. I am ready to do anything consistent with my judgment and conscience; but I am

ashamed to do that for fear of shame from men, for which my conscience may suggest to me that Jesus Christ will be ashamed of me at the great day. I imagine, by something spoken on my trial, that your Lordship conceived I had written some deriding, scornful expressions of the holy Jesus, which I am sure I never designed; the sum of the whole book being only to show the Father to be greater than he, not denying him any glory consistent with that. I hope that, as the great and merciful God will sooner forgive many errors of the understanding than one wilful crime, so your Lordship will make a considerable difference between disputable errors which men of probity and learning are divided about, and scurrilous reflections on the blessed Jesus, which are intended for contempt, and which my soul shall ever abhor. I shall only presume to add, that as it is entirely for my conscience that I suffer, so I can never be deprived of the comfortable support which such a consideration carries in it; having, I hope, learned in some measure to be conformed to Him who endured the cross, and who will shortly appear the righteous Judge of all. Knowing how much depends on your Lordship's favour and clemency as to the penalty I am liable to, I entreat for it; and am,

"Your Lordship's &c."

When he appeared to receive judgment, and refused to retract, the Chief Justice sentenced him to suffer a year's imprisonment, to pay a thousand pounds to the Queen, to be imprisoned till the fine was paid, and to find security for good behaviour during life! Instead of the pillory, which he was told was dispensed with because he was a man of letters, he was led round the four courts with a paper on his breast to be exposed.

After sentence, he was closely confined in the house of the under-sheriff for about a quarter of a year, but was then transferred to the common gaol, where he lay for five or six weeks in a close room surrounded by the other prisoners; but was afterwards removed, on petition for the sake of his health, to the Marshalsea, where he had more accommodation. Here he wrote his "General Remarks on Mr. Boyse's Vin-

dication of the True Deity of our blessed Saviour." In this situation he remained for two years, his imprisonment being prolonged in consequence of the non-payment of his fine. At length this heavy and (as it appears) *illegal* fine was reduced to seventy pounds, which was paid into her Majesty's exchequer. But the Archbishop of Armagh, who (as Queen's Almoner) had a claim, it seems, of a shilling in the pound on all fines, was not to be thus satisfied, but insisted for some time on the full amount of his per centage on the whole fine. At last, after several applications and letters, he was beat down to twenty pounds, which he had the meanness to take; "thinking it no blemish to his charity or generosity to make this advantage of the misery of one who for conscience towards God had endured grief."

After his release he shortly removed to London, where he preached for some time to a small congregation of friends who entertained similar opinions with himself, but without receiving any salary.

Mr. Emlyn continued to appear before the public as the author of various able tracts, both in support of the principles for which he had suffered, and on other theological questions.

In 1726, on the death of the excellent Mr. James Pierce, of Exeter, it was proposed to invite Mr. Emlyn to become his successor. As soon, however, as he was acquainted with it, he requested them to desist, thanking them for their respectful attention to him, and excusing himself from accepting an invitation on the ground of his declining years and increasing infirmities. He was naturally of a very cheerful and lively temper, and enjoyed a good state of health through the greater part of his life, the gout excepted, which by degrees impaired his constitution, and to which he finally fell a sacrifice on the thirtieth of July, 1743, in the eighty-first year of his age.

The name of Thomas Emlyn well deserves to be had in affectionate remembrance and veneration by those, whatever their religious sentiments may be, who duly value simplicity and godly sincerity, and the genuine graces of the Christian character, made manifest not only in

sufferings for conscience sake, but in unaffected piety and purity of life. He is chiefly known to posterity as a venerable confessor, who rejoiced that he was thought worthy to suffer shame, and loss, and imprisonment for the Gospel truth. But he was not less remarkable for a meek devotion, and for the practical influence of Christian principles, which were equally his guides in prosperity, while all men spoke well of him, and his consolation and support in the period of adversity and persecution. Others have gone through more severe bodily sufferings, but none have displayed in their conduct and their sentiments more of the spirit of Him who "when he was reviled, reviled not again."

THE SUMMER MONTHS.

THEY come! the merry summer months
Of beauty, love, and flowers;
They come! the glad some months that bring
Thick leafiness to bowers.
Up, up, my heart, and walk abroad,
Fling work and care aside;
Seek silent hills, or rest thyself
Where peaceful waters glide;
Or underneath the shadow vast
Of patriarchal tree,
See through its leaves the cloudless sky
In wrapt tranquillity.
The grass is soft; its velvet touch
Is grateful to the hand;
And, like the kiss of maiden love,
The breeze is sweet and bland;
The daisy and the buttercup
Are nodding courteously;
It stirs their blood with kindest love,
To bless and welcome thee.
And mark how with thine own thin locks—
They now are silver gray—
That blissful breeze is wantoning
And whispering "Be gay!"
There is no cloud that sails along
The ocean of yon sky,
But hath its own winged mariners
To give it melody.
Thou seest their glittering fans outspread,
All gleaming like red gold;
And hark! with shrill pipe musical,
Their merry course they hold.
God bless them all, these little ones,
Who, far above this earth,
Can make a scoff of its mean joys,
And vent a nobler mirth.
But, soft! mine ear upcaught a sound—
From yonder wood it came;
The spirit of the dim green glade
Did breathe his own glad name.
Yes, it is he! the hermit bird,
That, apart from all his kind,

Slow spells his beads monotonous
To the soft western wind.
Cuckoo! Cuckoo! he sings again—
His notes are void of art,
But simplest strains do soonest sound
The deep founts of the heart.
Good Lord! it is a gracious boon
For thought-crazed wight like me,
To smell again these summer flowers,
Beneath this summer tree!
To suck once more, in every breath,
Their little souls away,
And feed my fancy with fond dreams
Of youth's bright summer day;
When, rushing forth like untamed colt,
The reckless truant boy
Wandered through green woods all day long,
A mighty heart of joy!
I'm sadder now—I have had cause;
But, oh! I'm proud to think
That each pure joy-fount loved of yore
I yet delight to drink;
Leaf, blossom, blade, hill, valley, stream,
The calm, unclouded sky,
Still mingle music with my dream,
As in the days gone by.
When summer loveliness and light
Fall round me dark and cold,
I'll bear indeed life's heaviest curse,—
A heart that hath waxed old.

MOTHERWELL.

HOPE EVER.

HOPE on—Hope ever;—
Though the toils of life are hard to bear,
Thy weary feet shall one day rest in heav'n,
where thou shalt share
The blessed fruit of all thy toil,
Wrought on this clay and cloddy soil.
HOPE on—Hope ever;—
Turn not back, nor let your hopes decline,
But onward, onward to the goal, where love and
peace divine
Shall fill thy soul with heavenly light,
And make thy future ever bright.
HOPE on—Hope ever;
Should you fall, ask God for strength to rise,
And let your Master, even Christ, prepare you
for the skies;
His aid he freely gives to all,
The rich and poor, the great and small.
HOPE on—Hope ever;—
Guard and help the wretched, starving poor;
Point out to them a heavenly home, beyond this
desert moor;
Inspire their souls with hope and love,
Which lead to brighter worlds above.
HOPE on—Hope ever;—
Let thy FAITH be firmly fixed in God,
And HOPE with all her brightest train shall light
thee from the sod;
Let CHARITY thy ways adorn,
And thou shalt see eternal morn.
Cosely.

D. M.

A CONFUTATION.

"A GOD ALL MERCY
IS A GOD UNJUST."—*Dr. Young.*

D. CADMAN.

WE undertake the refutation of this proposition for two reasons:—first, because of the importance of the subject itself: second, because of the constant use made of this expression of the poet by the orthodox. The expression, at first sight, seems weighty and important—it sounds almost oracular, and seems to carry a world of meaning; but when closely examined and carefully analysed, it is found to signify just nothing, to say the best of it. In proof of this assertion we proceed to show that a two-fold fallacy is involved in the poet's proposition; or, to speak more correctly, it contains a *fallacy* and a *falsity*.

I.—We will deal first with the fallacy. We have often thought what a pity it was that the author of the "Night Thoughts" did not look at *both sides* of his subject. If he had reversed his proposition, "A God all mercy is a God unjust," and compared the two resulting statements, he might have paused before putting it on record, and might even have been prevented from sending abroad a statement opposed, in our opinion, alike to reason and Scripture. Let us apply the test—let us look at the other side;—in other words, let us reverse the poet's proposition. If it be true that "A God all mercy is a God unjust," then must it be equally true that "A God all justice is a God unmerciful." We do not see how our orthodox friends, who are the strenuous advocates of the absolute inflexibility of divine justice, can avoid being impaled on the horns of the dilemma.

We hold it to be an incontrovertible axiom that there is, and can be, no opposition, no contrariety, no antagonism between any of the divine attributes. To suppose that such can be the case would be to suppose change, imperfection, and consequently infelicity in the Deity. The fallacy involved in the poet's proposition consists, in our view, in regarding *justice* as the opposite of

mercy; in other words, we think that the poet was deceived by the seeming antithesis contained in his proposition. The habit of speaking of the justice of God, as if it were a person, has, no doubt, been the principal cause of its being regarded as something not only distinct from his mercy, but opposed to it; and Milton's well-known expression, "Die he or justice must," has helped to strengthen and perpetuate the error. The justice of God is not a person, a sentient being, distinct from God himself. We go farther, and say, divine justice is not a *part* of God. The Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, in his sermon, "Christ the Ransom paid by the Father," says truly, "God's justice is not a thing distinct and apart from him, but *is* himself feeling and acting in a certain manner." We are accustomed to think and speak of the attributes of Deity as so many component parts or portions of the divine nature, and this in the face of a prominent "article of faith," of the leading section of Protestant Christendom, which asserts that God is "without body, parts, or passions." A higher authority has declared, "God is a spirit;" and spirit or mind is a simple substance, one and indivisible. We cannot decompose spirit, and separate it into a certain number of parts, and say, "here is *wisdom* and there is *power*, this is *mercy* and that is *justice*, as an anatomist dissects a subject, and pointing to one member or portion of the body after another, says, 'that is the *head*, and these are the *lungs*, here is the *heart*, and this is the *pericardium*.'" The attributes or properties of mind, and consequently the divine attributes, may be made the objects of thought and contemplation separately and apart from the substance to which they belong, or rather are supposed to belong; but they cannot actually be taken and separated from it.

If justice is distinct from mercy, and opposed to it; if it is indeed true that "A God all mercy is a God unjust," then it follows, as a necessary consequence, the more merciful God is the more unjust He must be; and reversing the statement—*looking at the other side*—the more just God is, the more unmerciful He must be. The former part of

this corollary or inference being the principle against which we are contending, need not detain us here; the latter part demands a moment's consideration. Before we proceed, however, we think it right to remark, that the *former* part of the above corollary is simply the rendering of the poetical language in which the sentiment controverted is expressed into the language of plain prose, used in every day life. But it is the latter part of the corollary which now requires our attention. "The more just God is the more unmerciful He must be." If this is true of the Divine Being, it must be true of all intelligent beings; in other words, it must be true in principle and universally—"the more just the more unmerciful." Is this in accordance with general experience and observation? Does history corroborate this view of the case? We venture to assert that reason, common sense, and the best feelings of our nature are against it. Is it usual to associate in our minds the want of mercy with justice? Do we ever say, did we ever hear it said, "Such a judge is so just that he is a stranger to pity, and his decisions are always and necessarily marked with hardness and cruelty?" Whoever imagined that Justice and humanity were incompatible? Did any one ever dream that Aristides, the Just, was unmerciful?

The proposition of the poet, we repeat, is based on the assumed incompatibility of mercy and justice—it supposes justice to be the opposite of mercy. Nothing can have two opposites. Vice is the opposite of virtue, and we cannot conceive of virtue having any other opposite. The same may be said of any other two qualities. Furthermore, the opposite of a thing may be defined to be that which is placed at the greatest distance in point of resemblance and compatibility from it. If a thing is supposed to have two or more opposites, these opposites must be like one another, or they must be unlike. If they are like, they are at the same distance in point of resemblance or compatibility from that of which they are the opposite; and also, being all opposites, they are all at the greatest distance from it; and therefore they are all in effect the same. If they are unlike, then they are at different

distances in point of resemblance and compatibility; but the one the farthest removed from that of which they are all assumed to be opposites is alone the opposite, according to the definition given above. *Justice* is not and cannot be the opposite of *mercy*; for the opposite of mercy is cruelty, and surely no one will contend that justice and cruelty are identical; and we have seen that nothing can have two opposites. If it be asked, Is there not such a thing as severe justice? We answer decidedly—No. "Severe justice!" It is a contradiction in terms. Severity and justice are incompatible ideas. As well talk of unjust justice or unmerciful mercy! As soon as justice becomes severe, it ceases to be justice. Severity is cruelty, and cruelty is injustice. If cruelty is the opposite of mercy, and cruelty is injustice, then *injustice* and not *justice* is the opposite of mercy. Again, if justice is the opposite of mercy, mercy must be the opposite of justice; but clearly *injustice* is the opposite of justice, and surely the most orthodox will not have the hardihood to assert that *mercy* and *injustice* are identical; and as nothing can have more than one opposite, mercy cannot be the opposite of justice, and therefore justice is not the opposite of mercy. If injustice is the opposite of mercy, and also the opposite of justice, it follows necessarily that mercy and justice are identical.

MERCY IS JUSTICE, AND JUSTICE IS MERCY!

If we have taken a correct view of the subject under discussion; if our reasoning be valid we think we are justified in saying, that the author of the "Night Thoughts" and his abettors are guilty of the very fault which "our infidels" are charged with committing:

"They set at odds Heaven's jarring attributes,
And with one excellence another wound!"

II.—We come now to consider the *falsity* contained in the poet's proposition. The falsity clearly implied, though not expressed in so many words, is, That God is not all mercy. If the poet's line does not say this, it says nothing—it has no meaning. We ask our orthodox friends if the poet had plainly, and in so many words, asserted that God was not all mercy, would they not have been

shocked? Would they not have hesitated before they made the poet's assertion their own, and helped to give it currency in the Christian world? We say, that though it is, not asserted in so many words, it is expressed by the clearest implication. The poet's line must, in fact, be regarded as the *major* proposition of a syllogism, and the formula completed will stand thus (put hypothetically):

"If God were all mercy, He would be unjust;
But God is not unjust;
Therefore, God is not all mercy."

"God is not all mercy!" We say, this is a *falsity*. We do not call it a *falsehood*—a *lie*—because we are sure that the poet did not intend or wish to utter what was untrue, and because we are as sure that when our orthodox friends quote the poet's line, they believe they are uttering a great, a momentous truth. But we repeat it, solemnly and emphatically, it is a *falsity*—it is not true—it is contrary to truth—to the truth written by the finger of God in the human heart, and to the Scriptures of truth. The *minor* proposition of the above syllogism expresses an undeniable truth—"God is not unjust;" but who does not see that the *major* is a mere assumption—a *petitio principii*. It requires proof itself, and therefore, though the *minor* is unquestionably true, no valid conclusion can be drawn from the two propositions compared together. We say, solemnly and decidedly, "God is all mercy." We will endeavour to prove the truth of *our* proposition: 1st. By adducing testimony in its favour from our opponents themselves. 2nd. By arguments drawn from the sacred Scriptures.

To be continued.

BORN AGAIN.

A HUMOROUS old man fell in with an ignorant and rather impertinent young minister, who proceeded to inform the old gentleman, in very positive terms, that he would never reach heaven unless he was born again, and added: "I have experienced that change, and now feel no anxiety."

"And you have been born again!" said his companion, musingly.

"Well," said the old gentleman, eyeing him attentively, "I shouldn't think it would hurt you, young man, to be born once more."

THE INTERCESSOR.

"Now, sir, go out of that door, and never, so long as you live, dare to cross over its threshold again."

"Very well, sir, I will obey you to the last day of my life."

The first of these speakers was a man whose life had slid beyond its fiftieth birthday. His hair was sifted with grey, and wrinkles had begun to gather on his forehead. He was tall and fine looking, and of commanding presence, though the veins on his temples were swollen with passion. As he spoke he rose up, and brought down his clenched hand on the table with a blow which sent a shiver through it.

The last speaker was a youth, just on the threshold of his twentieth year. He had the strong, stern features of the elder man, and the same thin, compressed lips, but there was a softer light in the brown eyes, and something in the whole face which would have won you quicker than the old man's, though it was stern and livid as the dead. As he rose and walked to the library door, and answered his father with those words which sealed his dismissal from his home, and sent him out into the world helpless and alone, soft, eager words streamed like a silver flowing rivulet down the stairs, and caught the young man's ear, just as his hand was on the door-knob,—

"Edward—Edward, I say, where are you going?"

And the next moment bounded down to him a fair child, whose golden hair was the colour of the dandelions which were just opening in the spring meadows, while her azure eyes were full of smiles, deepened and confirmed by the sweet lips beneath them.

"I am going, Mary—don't ask me." But as she lifted up her bright, wistful face, he suddenly placed his hand over it, as though it was more than he could bear.

"Oh, Edward, what is the matter? Have you and papa been quarreling again?"

"Yes; and now I must leave you." His voice shook huskily along the syllables.

"For how long?"

"For ever, little sister! He has sent me away, and I shall never come again."

"Oh, Edward, Edward!" and she lifted up her little, soft, white arms, and closed them around his neck. "You don't mean it. You won't go away and leave your little Mary. She can't live without you," and she pulled down his cheek to her face, and her tears dripped like rain upon it.

"Oh, yes, she can, if she'll only make up her mind to." He was trying to speak in a cheerful voice now, and caressing the golden ringlets in which the May sunbeams were fluttering. "She'll be a brave, good girl, and put a bold face on the matter, and I won't forget her when I am gone, and I shall write her a long letter one of these days."

He took her up in his arms, and pressed her tightly to his heart, and the sternness went for a moment out of the young man's face.

"I can't help it, Mary, little sister, that I love better than anything on the face of the earth, and I want you to remember this, whether you ever see me again or not. But it won't do to give way now. Father has turned me out of his house once and for ever." And here his face settled back into its old sternness once more.

The little girl stood still, and shivered, "Go, Edward."

Then her sweet face suddenly flashed up through its tears to him.

"I will go straight to papa, and beg him to take you back;" and she would have sprung away from her brother, but he held her back forcibly.

"Never, Mary, never will I look upon his face again. It is useless to intercede now. He has turned me, like a dog, from his threshold, and I cross it now for the last time."

That stern face, and the clenched hand, which he brought down on the door-knob, froze the tears on the child's face.

Then the young man turned toward her, and the fierce light went out of his eyes.

"Mary, little sister, good-bye. Don't forget me, and to pray for me every night." He broke down here, and kiss-

ing her forehead three or four times, he darted out of the house.

"But, papa, you haven't sent him away for ever, and he will come back some time;" and she pressed up her soft, wet cheeks to the old man's, and her small fingers fluttered amongst his gray sprinkled hair, like a flock of newly fledged birds.

"Mary, you must never speak to me of him again. Edward has offended me, past forgiveness, and he is no longer a son of mine, or a brother of yours. I have disowned him; and now, remember, I must be obeyed."

The old man held her, his fair young child, in his lap, as he uttered the cruel words, his face still rigid, and his brow knotted with blue veins, but his hand rested tenderly on her bright hair, for Mary Reynolds was her father's idol.

There was no sound in the great library, but the broken sobs of the little girl.

"Come, daughter, don't;" it is wonderful how those stern tones fell into a sweetness that was like a mother's. "Papa will be very kind to his little girl, and make her very happy, and she must not trouble him by grieving so."

At last the child lifted her head, and her glance fell upon the portrait of a lady opposite, set in a richly carved frame.

The face was still young, and the sweetness of the azure eyes, and the fluttering smiles about the lips, and the soft delicacy of the whole face, would have won your heart to it at once.

"Papa, I am glad now, that she died before I can remember her."

"My child, what do you mean?" with tones full of amazement.

"Because, papa, it would have broken her heart."

The old man set down his child, and she went out of the library. His stern lips did not quiver, nor his iron will falter in its purpose, but there rose up before him a fair picture of that young face, above which the grass had been growing for eleven years, as it bent with proud, mother-tenderness over a little brown, curly head, which she was lifting up for its father's kiss; and the baby stretched out its hands, and crowed

triumphantly, as his fingers clutched the man's hair, and this baby was his first-born child, and he had turned him for ever from his doors. Mary had spoken the truth. It was well that her mother was dead, for it would have broken her heart.

William Reynolds, the banker, was a stern, resolute man, honourable in his dealings with all men, but sympathetic, pitiful to none. He had married late in life a woman much younger than himself, one who combined rare graces of heart and mind, and who had opened all the hidden springs of tenderness in this cold, undemonstrative nature. Their son had inherited the warm impulses of his mother, with the inflexible will of his father, and after the death of the former a gradual estrangement developed itself between the two, and the gentle, healing element of the mother was not there to reconcile those she loved. Matters grew worse and worse, until, after having graduated at college, the young man flatly refused to gratify his father's darling ambition of succeeding him in business, he having chosen the law for his profession.

A long and severe altercation ensued betwixt the father and son. Harsh, fierce words passed between them, for both were equally determined and angry, and the whole ended in the rich banker turning his son for ever from his threshold.

CHAPTER II.

"No hope?"

"None at all, my dear sir, I am compelled to tell you that your child will never behold the sunset."

The proud, stern man turned away, hid his face in his hands, and groaned heavily. The sunshine fluttered and flitted like the sweet, tremulous dreams of youth, all about the lofty chamber in which that fair child lay dying, smitten suddenly by a fever, which had drunk the springs of her young life, and kindled her pulses with fire that death only could quench.

"Papa, papa," the voice came up faint and eager from the parched, pallid lips, and the old man went to the bedside, and leaned tenderly over the white, ghastly face, which wore that look

which faces only wear over which the grass will grow in a little while.

"What is it, my precious child?"

"Papa, I heard what the doctor said, and now I am going away from you so soon you will let me see *him* just once before I die?"

The banker's face grew white as the little white frozen one beneath it; and he made a deprecatory motion with his hands. Mary raised herself painfully from her pillow, and clung to him.

"Oh, papa, you won't refuse your little Mary's last prayer. You will be so sorry if you do, when I am gone, and I shall see mamma in a little while, and I shall know her face in heaven, although I never did on earth; and when she asks me after her boy, how can I tell her that you wouldn't let me see him?"

"Lie down, Mary, your brother shall be sent for," answered the stricken man.

"Has he come, oh, papa, has he come?" and she gasped out the words from lips that were growing cold in death.

"Yes, Mary, darling sister, I am here, and the young man sprung forward, and folded his arms about her, and his tears dropped on her head—for they had shaved away the long golden curls which crowned it—like rain. She smiled up in his face, and her little cold fingers scampered tremulously up his shoulder, and rested with the old caress in his dark brown hair. Then her face grew troubled.

"It is growing dark, I cannot see you. Papa, Edward, take hold of my hands."

And the old man and the young one took her small hands, and she clasped theirs together.

"Papa, you will take him back to your heart once more? I may tell mamma that you have forgiven him?"

"I will take him back—I have forgiven him," and the old man's voice was husky, because of its sobs.

A last smile went like the dying sunshine over the child's face; and Mary Reynolds' soul went out like the day, without convulsion or struggle.

And the father and the son fell into each other's arms, and wept like Jacob and Joseph of old.

EXPLANATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL
TEXTS ADVANCED TO SUSTAIN
UNSCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES.

VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.

THERE is no question at issue between Trinitarians and Unitarians that should have a more thorough, impartial, and calm consideration than the doctrine of Atonement. We cannot be fairly charged with not holding the doctrine, for we do hold it, and profess that the GREAT WORK of Christ was *reconciliation or at-one-ment*. The difference is, we hold that the death of Christ, accompanied as it was with suffering, is to lead us to God in goodness of life, *not* to appease the wrath or placate the vengeance of Deity, but simply and entirely to effect a change of life in us; and all the passages of Scripture, we think, may be thus understood, without having recourse to a theory which is contrary to the character of God, as revealed to us in a thousand places of Scripture. We will now examine the various texts that are adduced by Trinitarians in support of their view that Christ died in our room and stead.

Titus ii. 14.—“Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.”—We have placed this passage first, because it is really the key-note of all the passages bearing on his suffering and death. Christ lived and taught, and suffered and died, to redeem us from all iniquity. “Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world.”—Gal. i. 4.—It does not say from the wrath of God, but from the present evil world, he died to save us.

John i. 29.—“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”—The reader will observe that Christ is spoken of in this passage as in almost all the texts, to take away the sin of the world. He lived and died to take away sin. “And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin.”—1 John iii. 5.—To redeem us from iniquity, to purify us from sin. His death is not spoken of as saving us from the punishment due to actual transgression, but to save us *from* sin. His name shall be called Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins. So he is the Lamb of God, to take away the sin of the world, and only in this manner does he save from the punishment due to sin.

Hebrews ix. 26.—“For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.”—Here again the object of the sacrifice is full in view. It was self-sacrifice “TO PUT AWAY SIN.” This is the Unitarian view. Such

a Saviour teaches us to put away selfishness. “He laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.” “Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it.” “Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow in his steps.” “He hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” What a pattern of benevolence in self-sacrifice!

1 John i. 9.—“If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”—We must repent of our sins and turn from them, and then God will forgive us our sins, and thus are we cleansed from all unrighteousness. The teaching of Scripture is one upon this matter. The wicked have to forsake their sin, the unrighteous have to turn away from their evil thoughts, and then it is God has mercy and pardons sin. This is being cleansed from all unrighteousness.

1 John ii. 12.—“I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake.”—This is similar in its import to the previous passage. The name of a person in Scripture is often used as synonymous with the spirit or attributes of a person. If we have the spirit of Christ, or walk in obedience to Christ, our sins are forgiven us. The one condition of forgiveness, that runs through all Scripture, is repentance and newness of life. “Repent and be converted (be changed), that your sins may be blotted out.”

Matt. xxvi. 28.—“For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”—As you see this wine poured out, so shall my blood be poured out. Now mark, Christ never once spoke of his death as placating wrath, or used any form of speech that favours Trinitarian views of that death. My blood is shed for the remission of sins; not the remission of the punishment of sin as is held by so many, but the remission or putting away of sin. This testimony is uniform with all the texts of Scripture which speak of that death. Without the influence of that death removes sin, it removes nothing, accomplishes nothing, is nothing to the church or the world.

Mark x. 45.—“For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”—His blood and his life are interchangeable terms. He spent his life, he gave his life, he laid down his life to ransom us from sin, to redeem us from all iniquity.

1 Thess. v. 10.—“Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.”—No greater love could Christ show the world than this, no more powerful influence could he bring to bear upon the wayward affections of mankind than to live, and labour, and die, that we should live together with him: that we should be in communion with him.

1 Cor. xv. 3.—“For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.”—It would be well if Christians would keep to the Scriptural doctrine of the death of Christ, and understand it according to the Scripture. Already we have adduced numerous passages which show that he died to deliver us from sin, to ransom us from sin, to redeem us from all iniquity.

Hebrews i. 3.—“Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”—The epistle to the Hebrews has been greatly relied on as upholding the vicarious sacrifice view, *i. e.*, Christ dying to absolve all punishment due to sin. Here again the object is stated in plain language, he died to purge our sins, to cleanse us from sin, to wash away sin.

Hebrews ix. 14.—“How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.”—This is identical with the foregoing passage; Christ shed his blood to purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Hebrews x. 10.—“By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” Hebrews x. 14.—“For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”—The offering is spoken of as still effecting man, not God; to perfect us and to sanctify us. The words rendered perfected has the same signification as the remission of sin. This passage is uniform with the other texts. These texts are all quoted to uphold the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice; we see no bearing they have upon that subject; and they fully express our view of the object of Christ's death. Thus we learn that God thought no means too dear to save us from sinfulness of life, and we know that we have not been redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ as a lamb without blemish and without spot.

1 Cor. vi. 20.—“For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.” 1 Peter i. 18.—“Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers.” 1 Cor. vii. 23.—“Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men.”—These and similar passages enjoin watchfulness of life, as Christ has suffered and died to save us from sinfulness. We are taught to be grateful to God, and not be the servants of our lusts, or of useless traditions, or of men, but the servants of Christ who gave himself for us to redeem us.

1 John i. 7.—“But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sins.”—The Apostle is urging to righteousness of life, and takes the high ground that the death, as well as the life of Jesus Christ, cleanseth from sin. There is nothing said in those texts about the blood of Christ appeasing wrath or satisfying divine justice, but cleansing from sin is the effect spoken of. Where that love of Christ is felt and leads to Christ-like life, obedience to his word and example, there it cleanses from sin. Thus it is salvation is sometimes ascribed to the word of Christ, sometimes to his life, and sometimes to his death or blood; but there is no salvation where there is no saving from sin. “We must walk in the light as he is in the light, then we have fellowship one with another and with Christ.”

Revelations i. 5.—“And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.”—That is by his life and death he has given unto us newness of life, washed us from our sins, redeemed us from our sins, purified us by his example; this is attributed to his death. No one can read all those passages without being struck with the fact that their testimony is uniform to salvation from sin.

2 Cor. v. 18, 19.—“And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.”—The teaching of the New Testament on the doctrine of reconciliation is the very reverse of the Trinitarian system, which represents God being reconciled to man through Christ; whereas the Scripture speaks of man being reconciled to God through Christ. Christ reconciles us to God. This text teaches us that this plan of reconciliation is of God, who hath sent Jesus Christ to draw us unto him; we have to forsake our sins, and they will cease to be charged against us any more; and we can be one with Christ, and thus one with God.

Col. i. 19, 20, 21.—“For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.”—The testimony of this passage is precisely the same as the other, we are aliens from God by wicked works. God in the fulness of mercy sends Jesus Christ to draw us from sin; this is effected by his life and

perfected by his death. He hath died, as the following verse teaches, to present us holy and unblameable, and unreprouable in his sight. On whom Christ hath effected this change they are reconciled.

Eph. ii. 13.—“But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.”—The reader cannot fail to observe whatever efficacy is ascribed to the blood of Christ, it is spoken of as affecting us, not God. We were far off, and now are made nigh, *i. e.*, reconciled, brought near in goodness of life. “If I be lifted up,” said Christ, “I will draw all men unto me.” Not, “I will draw God to man, but man will be led to forsake his sin, and draw near unto God.” The whole Scriptural teaching is this from beginning to end of the Bible.

Eph. ii. 14, 16.—“For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us. . . . And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.”—The whole of this chapter is a beautiful exposition of God’s plan, through Christ, to make one people of both Jew and Gentile nations. That all the differences that existed in former times of commandments were taken away; that they now had one master, one law or commandment; they had one great sacrifice, Christ, to unite them all in one body; that they be no more strangers and foreigners, but all fellow-citizens of the household of God.

1 Peter iii. 18.—“For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.”—The Apostle, in the preceding verses, is urging Christians to bear with persecution patiently; to walk with a good conscience, to avoid all evil; and when they suffer, to suffer for well doing; for Christ, who was the sinless and the just, once suffered for sin, the just for the unjust; for he suffered to teach us to be like him, and thus to bring us unto God, or to Godlikeness. Many a Christian hath suffered for sin or through sin: as just persons they have suffered through the injustice of others, and often they have seen the fruit of their meekness, patience, and benevolence in reclaiming men from sin. He suffered to bring us to God.

Hebrews ii. 17.—“Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.”—He is a merciful and faithful high priest: merciful, inasmuch as he knows all our infirmities, he was touched with the feeling of them, yet without sin; and therefore by his sinlessness he makes reconciliation, draws us from our sins to God.

Rom. iii. 25.—“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that are past, through the forbearance of

God.” 1 John ii. 2.—“And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our’s only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” 1 John iv. 10.—“Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins.”—The word rendered “*propitiation*” in these three texts is the same word as is rendered “*reconciliation*” in other texts of the New Testament. The bringing about of a good understanding between two parties is the primary meaning of the word. God hath set forth Jesus Christ to be the great reconciliation; so we need look to no other sacrifice for the remission of our sins than to the righteousness that is in him. He sent his Son to draw us from our sins; this is done by his death or blood, as well as by other means which he employs. Christ is a propitiation, and his death is a propitiatory sacrifice most truly, in a gospel sense, when it draws mankind to repentance, and averts the divine displeasure that visits a sinful life. Christ is the medium of reconciliation that makes man at peace with God, and this is the only at-one-ment that can avail us anything. He is the propitiation for our sins; not only is he able to draw us, but the whole world from sin. The word propitiation is also rendered by both Trinitarian and Unitarian scholars “*mercy-seat*.” This makes a just and beautiful allusion to the mercy-seat of old, from which the divine word was given, and forgiveness of sins was pronounced. This mercy-seat is consecrated by his own blood, and on this he takes his stand to declare the richness of the mercy of God, who gave his son: will he not therefore with him freely give us all things? Through the blood of Christ we have forgiveness and eternal life. He redeems us from sin and death.

1 Peter ii. 21.—“For even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps.”—His suffering for us is fully explained in this text; he left us an example of patience, benevolence, and self-sacrifice, that we might follow in his steps.

Hebrews xii. 2, 3.—“Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.”—The example of Christ is set before us, as worthy of our imitation, and a pattern of true patience in the midst of very trying circumstances.

1 Timothy ii. 6.—“Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.”—Jesus Christ delivered himself up to redeem all mankind from sin: and this will be known by all mankind in its proper time.

Eph. v. 2.—“And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for

us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour."—We know a great deal of the sacrificial theology can be made out of a text like this. It simply teaches us to walk in love, let life be dedicated by love to God and man, such love as Christ hath shown in laying down his life for human salvation, so we have to count nothing too dear to promote the happiness and salvation of our brethren. "He hath given himself for us." We are taught by John iii. 16, "He laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." The moral of that death is plain to any who will read the Scripture. It is spoken of as an "offering and a sacrifice." We are desired by the same writer "To present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service." This sacrifice of Christ is spoken of as a sweet smelling savour. So Paul speaks of their labour—2 Cor. ii. 15—"For we are unto God a sweet savour." We have said no passage can speak more strongly of Christ giving himself for us, as an *offering and sacrifice* unto God, as a *sweet savour* unto God; so does this very text point the moral, and the experience of the writer, Paul, affords the proof that Christians are to be as an offering or sacrifice, even as Christ was for the Church, and that this is a sweet savour unto God.

The sufferings and death of Christ are spoken of in the New Testament in view of moral and religious advantages in that positive form which proves the assumption of the vicarious hypothesis quite gratuitous. His death and resurrection are used by apostolic writers to strengthen our conviction in his Messiahship; and the public way in which he suffered and died, and rose again, to confirm us in our own resurrection. It is also used as evidence of the great love of God to mankind to redeem mankind. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son." The offering of Christ is not spoken of as the CAUSE of God's love, but the EFFECT, which is a complete contravention of the vicarious hypothesis. It is also spoken of as the seed of the Gospel; that it is attested by his blood, "the blood of the everlasting gospel." Also that Christ himself is made a perfect Saviour by these trials: "For in that he himself hath suffered, he is able to succour them that are tempted." "The Captain of our Salvation is made perfect through suffering." "He learned obedience by the things which he suffered." His death is spoken of in the most direct forms of speech that are completely opposed to the spirit and teaching of the vicarious sacrifice theory. From sin Christ came to deliver us, and thus from its consequences; whereas it is from the consequences of a broken law, rather than law-breaking, as is generally regarded by the great body of Christians. Can any words express the moral teaching of that death better than those of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 15? He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again.

To be continued.

WHAT SHALL WE BUILD?

OR A PEARL FROM THE SEA-SIDE.

"Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger."

FOUR children were playing on the sea-shore. They had gathered bright pebbles and beautiful shells, and written their names in the pure, white sand; but at last, tired of their sport, they were about going home, when one of them, as they came to a pile of stones, cried out:

"Oh! let us build a fort; and we will call that ship, away out there, an enemy's vessel, and make believe we are firing great cannon balls at her!"

"Yes, yes! let us build a fort," responded Edward, the other lad.

And the two boys—for two were boys and two girls—ran off to the pile of stones, and began removing them to a place near the water.

"Come, Anna and Jane," said they, "come and help us."

"Oh, no. Don't let us build a fort," said Jane.

"Yes; we will build a fort," returned the boys. "What else can we build? You wouldn't put a house down here on the water's edge?"

"No; but I'll tell you what we can build, and it will be a great deal better than a fort?"

"Well, what can we build?"

"A light-house," said the girls; "and that will be just as much in place on the edge of the sea as a fort. We can call the ship yonder a vessel lost in the darkness, and we will hang out a light and direct her in the true way. Won't that be much better than to call her an enemy, and build a fort to destroy her? See how beautifully she sits upon and glides over the smooth water! Her sails are like the open wings of a bird, and they bear her gracefully along. Would it not be cruel to shoot great balls into her sides, tear her sails to pieces, and kill the men who are on board of her? Oh, I am sure it would make us all happier to save her when in darkness and danger. No, no; let us not build a fort, but a light-house; for it is better to save than to destroy."

The girls spoke with tenderness and enthusiasm, and their words reached the better feelings of their companions.

"Oh, yes," said they, "we will build a light-house, and not a fort." And they did so.

Yes, it is much better to save than to destroy. Think of that, and let it go with you through life. Be more earnest to save your friends than to destroy your enemies; and yet, when a real enemy comes, and seeks to do evil, be brave to resist him.

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

BROWN was asked if he didn't think Mrs. S. was deeply pious. "Yes," said Brown, "her piety is so deep that I never could see any bottom to it."

THE SOUL.—Whatever that be which thinks, which understands, which wills, which acts, it is something celestial and divine; and, upon that account, must necessarily be eternal.—*Cicero.*

WHAT KILLS MEN.—It is not work that kills men; it is worry. Work is healthy; you can hardly put more upon a man than he can bear. Worry is rust upon the blade. It is not the revolution that destroys the machinery, but the friction.

FATHER TAYLOR, of Boston, the eccentric seaman's preacher, was once asked where he thought Ralph Waldo Emmerson would go after death. The witty old man replied, "The dear good blessed soul! I don't see in him any evidence of saving faith; but then I don't know what Satan would do with him."

LITTLE ALICE, dressed and prepared for a walk, was skipping back and forth through the entry, waiting for her mother to get ready to go out. Her little cousin said he was going out, too. "No!" said Alice, "you can't go—you are not dressed up!" Her Uncle laughingly remarked, that "the pride stuck out quite early." "No," answered Alice, "it isn't my pride, it's my new moreen skirt that sticks out so!"

WHAT IF GOD DIED.—A teacher in one of our Sunday Schools, speaking of the works of nature to his class, asked them what would become of all these things if God should die. A little boy of ten "raised his hand," as much as to say, I know. "Well, what?" said the teacher: "Why, if God died, everything else would die too." This is much sounder theology than the lines of Dr. Watts:

"When God the Mighty Maker died,
For man, the creature's sin."

LEIGH HUNT.—My father, though a clergyman of the Established Church, had settled, as well as my mother, into a Christian of the Universalist persuasion, which believes in the final restoration of all things. It was hence that I learned the impiety of the doctrine of eternal punishment. In the present day a sense of that impiety, in some way or other, whether of doubt or supposition, is the secret feeling of nine-tenths of all churches; and every church will discover, before long, that it must rid itself of the doctrine, if it would not cease to exist. *Love* is the only creed destined to survive all others. They who think that no church can exist without a strong spice of *terror*, should watch the growth of education, and see which system of it is the most beloved. They should see also which system in the very nursery is growing the most ridiculous. The threat of the "black man and the coal-hole" has vanished from all decent infant training. What answer is the father, who would uphold the worst form of it, to give to the child whom he has spared the best?

DISPLAY OF DRESS.—The lady who walks in the streets in a showy dress suitable only to a *fete*; who comes to a quiet social gathering with a profusion of costly jewellery; the man who electrifies a country village with the fashionable attire of Rotten Row; or reminds you of his guineas by a display of unnecessary jewels; the people, in short, who are always over-dressed for the occasion, may be set down as vulgar.—*Habits of Good Society.*

NONE LIVETH FOR HIMSELF.—God has written on the flowers that sweeten the air—on the breeze that rocks the flowers upon the stem—upon the rain drop that refreshes the sprig of moss that lifts its head in the desert—upon its deep chambers, upon every penciled sheet that sleeps in the cavern of the deep, no less than upon the mighty sun that warms and cheers millions of creatures which live in its light—upon all His works he has written—"None liveth for himself."

RELIGIOUS SQUIRES.—"Don't be vulgar, Aunt Ruth, and pray give over calling names, That is Bellows's professional business. *He calls it kindness of heart, and purity of spirit; but it isn't decent for a respectable coal merchant's wife to be so brutal.* As for telling which of us is a lost sheep, how can we decide? Bellows grumbles because all the Catholic flocks take the opposition road, and pay toll at the Pope's gate, and it is pretty much the same cry on the Romish side. Do you think that a religion which has borne hard wear and tear for more than a thousand years, is to be toppled over by a few of Bellows's greasy tracts? Don't you know why he writes these nuts, and paps, and gins? It isn't to convert the Catholics, as you think, but to convince and secure the Protestants, and prevent such as you from deserting to the opposition. That's the motive, only you cannot see through it."—*Welcome Guest.*

GOD'S PLAN OF YOUR LIFE.—Never complain of your birth, your training, your employment, your hardships; never fancy that you could be something, if only you had a different lot and sphere assigned you. God understands His own plan, and He knows what you want a great deal better than you do. The very things that you most deprecate as fatal limitations or obstructions, are probably what you most want. What you call hinderances, obstacles, discouragements, are probably God's opportunities; and it is nothing new that the patient should dislike his medicines, or any certain proof that they are poisons. No! a truce to all such impatience! Choke that devilish envy which gnaws at your heart, because you are not in the same lot with others; bring down your soul, or rather, bring it up to receive God's will, and do His work, in your lot, in your sphere, under your cloud of obscurity, against your temptations; and then you shall find that your condition is never opposed to your good, but really consistent with it.—*Dr. Bushnell.*

All Letters, Post Office Orders, &c., to be addressed to **ROBERT SPEARS**, Stockton-on-Tees.

Printed by **W. ROBINSON**, High-street, Stockton.